

REMARKS

The application contains claims 3-7, and 10, all of which are under examination.

Issues Under 35 USC § 112

The rejection of claims 1-8 and 10 in paragraphs 1 and 2 of the last Office Action, relating to the word "hairs", is traversed but is believed to have been overcome by the present amendments. Of the claims here rejected, only claims 1 and 8 contained this word. Both claims 1 and 8 have been canceled rendering their rejection moot. The subject matter of claim 1, including the word "hairs" has been introduced into non-rejected independent claims 5 and 6. The use of the word "hairs" in claims 5 and 6 is believed to be in full compliance with 35 USC § 112.

Support

Support for the amendments to claim 5 can be found in claims 1 and 2. In other words, claim 5 has been rewritten as an independent claim including all the limitations of claims 1 and 2 from which it originally depended. Claim 5 was neither rejected on 35 USC 102, nor on 35 USC 103, nor under any ground

whatsoever. Claim 5 is now free of all grounds of rejection and is clearly patentable.

Support for the amendments to claim 6 can be found in claim 1. In other words, claim 6 has also been rewritten as an independent claim including all the limitations of claim 1 from which it originally depended. Claim 6 was neither rejected on 35 USC 102 nor on 35 USC 103, nor under any ground whatsoever. Claim 6 is now free of all grounds of rejection and is clearly patentable.

Issues Under 35 USC § 102 and 103

The rejection of claims 1-3 and 10 in paragraph 5 of the last office action is traversed but has been rendered moot by the present amendment. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Claim 10 has been made dependent on non-rejected claims 5 and 6.

The rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 8, and 10 in paragraph 6 of the last office action is traversed but has been rendered moot by the present amendment. Claims 1, 2, and 8 have been canceled. Claims 3, 4, 7, and 10 have each been made dependent on non-rejected claims 5 and 6.

Summary

In summary it is respectfully submitted that all grounds of rejection have been overcome and that the Examiner would be justified in passing the case to issue. Such action is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David R. Murphy (Reg. No. 22,751) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
John W. Bailey, #32,881

gmu
JWB/DRM/drm/enm
0445-0293P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000